'THE GOOD OLD WAY': PRAYER BOOK PROTESTANTISM IN THE 1640s AND 1650s

by JUDITH MALTBY

Between 1640 and 1642 the Church of England collapsed, its leaders reviled and discredited, its structures paralysed, its practices if not yet proscribed, at least inhibited. In the years that followed, yet worse was to befall it. And yet in every year of its persecution after 1646, new shoots sprang up out of the fallen timber: bereft of episcopal leadership, lacking any power of coercion, its observances illegal, anglicanism thrived. As memories of the 1630s faded and were overlaid by the tyrannies of the 1640s... the deeper rhythms of the Kalendar and the ingrained perfections of Cranmer's liturgies bound a growing majority together.¹

ROFESSOR John Morrill, quoted above, has rightly identified a set of historiographical contradictions about the Stuart Church in a series of important articles.² Historians have until recently paid little attention to the positive and popular elements of conformity to the national Church of England in the period before the civil war. The lack of interest in conformity has led to a seventeenth-century version of the old Whig view of the late medieval Church: the Church of England is presented as a complacent, corrupt, and clericalist institution, 'ripe' – as the English Church in the early sixteenth century was 'ripe' – to be purified by reformers. However, if this was the case,

¹ John Morrill, 'The attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament', in idem, *The Nature of the English Revolution: Essays by John Morrill* (1993), 89. I am grateful to Elizabeth Clarke, Arnold Hunt, Elizabeth Macfarlane, and Alison Shell for comments on this essay.

² 'The religious context of the English Civil War' (1984); 'The attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament' (1984); 'The Church in England 1642-1649' (1982), republished in Morrill, Nature of the English Revolution. See also the introduction to that volume, 'Introduction: England's wars of religion'. There are useful discussions of the Church of England in the 1640s and 1650s in John Spurr, The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689 (New Haven, CT, 1991), ch. 1, and Robert Ashton, Counter-Revolution: the Second Civil War and Its Origins, 1646-8 (New Haven, CT, 1994), ch. 7. The most thorough treatment in print of the Church of England in this period, however, remains W.A. Shaw, A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth 1640-1660, 2 vols (1900).

how does one account for the durable commitment to the Prayer Book demonstrated during the 1640s and 1650s and the widespread – but not universal – support for the 'return' of the Church of England in 1660? This paper contributes to the larger exploration of the theme of 'the Church and the book' by addressing in particular the continued use by clergy and laity alike of one 'book' – the Book of Common Prayer – after its banning by Parliament during the years of civil war and the Commonwealth.

* *

In April 1660, three weeks before the Declaration of Breda and proclamation of Charles II, Easter, a forbidden Festival, was celebrated in most parish churches up and down the country. It was the collapse of the old church which presaged the downfall of the monarchy: and it was to be the church's survival which was to herald the Restoration.³

These are remarkable claims about a Church which in its pre-1642 historiography was dominated until recently by widespread acceptance of the critique of the godly.4 We can speak of a set of religious attitudes, practices, and beliefs which found authenticity, comfort, and renewal in conformity to the official and lawful forms of the Christian religion as offered by the Church of England. As civil war descended on the English portion of the British Isles, one could speak of a religious tradition which was firm in its loyalty to the Church of England, expressed principally in support for the liturgy and episcopacy, but unhappy about the Laudian innovations of the 1630s. This tradition found a voice in a series of petitions in support of episcopacy and the liturgy to the Long Parliament in the months leading up to the outbreak of the civil war. Although it is reasonable to assume that the tribulations of the middle of the century created marriages of convenience between Laudians and Prayer Book Protestants - indeed redrew some boundaries - it would be a mistake to see the views under

3 Morrill, 'Attack on the Church of England', 89-90.

⁴ For a historiographical critique, see Judith Maltby, Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England (Cambridge, 1998), 1-19. The work of Professor David Underdown is also critical to our concerns. Perhaps more than any other historian, Underdown has uncovered the popular elements of conservative or traditional politics in the 1640s-50s and has alerted us to the existence of considerable attachment to the 'Old Church', to the Prayer Book and Church festivals: see idem, Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660 (Oxford, 1987), esp. chs 5, 8, 9, 10.

examination in this essay as evidence of the 'popularity' of pre-civil war Laudianism. As Professor Robert Ashton has rightly remarked, 'Royalism was in fact a far more common Anglican characteristic [in the late 1640s] than ritualism.' Placing the early Stuart Church in a longer-term perspective of the events of the turbulent middle decades of the seventeenth century troubles some historiographical waters and raises some important questions about the popular life of the Church of England on either side of 1642.⁵

What to call the set of religious convictions explored in this essay is more than a problem of semantics or an excuse for pedantry. Terms like 'Prayer Book Protestants', 'Church of England loyalists' and 'followers of the "Old Church", however long-winded, are to be preferred to the term 'Anglicans'. To single out Prayer Book loyalists as 'the Anglicans' before the Restoration begs enormous scholarly and historical questions as it treats the emerging multi-denominational character of English Christianity after 1660 as a foregone conclusion.⁶ Further, it implies 'ownership' of a Church by particular groups within it and 'unchurches' sets of individuals who were as much a part of the ecclesia anglicana as those retrospectively canonized as the 'true Anglicans', as Professor Diarmaid MacCulloch has so rightly warned us, by the highly successful revisionists of the Oxford Movement.⁷

⁶ By the end of the eighteenth century the range of religious options available created, despite the existence of two established Churches in Britain, a pluralism more akin to the new United States than to much of the rest of Europe: James Obelkevich, 'Religion', in F.M.L. Thompson, ed., Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750–1950 (Cambridge, 1990), 311 and passim.

⁵ Ashton, Counter-Revolution, 230, though see below, 253-5, for caution about the shades of Royalism amongst Church of England loyalists. Maltby, Prayer Book and People, ch. 3; cadem, 'Petitions for Episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer 1641-1642', in Stephen Taylor, ed., From Cranmer to Davidson: a Church of England Miscellany, Church of England Record Society, 7 (Woodbridge, 2000), 105-67; David Underdown, A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford, 1996), 56-7. Cf. Christopher Haigh, 'The Church of England, the Catholics and the people', in Peter Marshall, ed., The Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640 (1997), 253-4 (first published 1984); Alexandra Walsham, 'The parochial roots of Laudianism revisited: Catholics, Anti-Calvinists and "Parish Anglicans" in early Stuart England', JEH, 49 (1998), 620-51.

⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The myth of the English Reformation', JBS, 30 (1991), 1-19. See also Maltby, Prayer Book and People, 233-7; Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 'Introduction', in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds, Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660 (Woodbridge, 2000), xix. However, see e.g. Christopher Haigh, English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors (Oxford, 1993); Walsham, 'Parochial roots'; Morrill, 'Church in England'; Ashton, Counter-Revolution, for the use of the word 'Anglican' in this period.

If we may now accept the existence of English Christians before 1642 whose religious identities and loyalties were formed and became informed by conformity to the established Church of England, yet can be properly distinguished from the Laudian agenda, a simple but important question emerges. What happened to that set of religious convictions in the face of a Parliamentary onslaught? In the 1640s, Parliament embarked on a series of legislation which achieved far more than the taking away of the Church of England's historic privileges and placing it on an equal footing with its emerging competitors in the religious marketplace. Rather, it was not disestablishment which was the aim but the proscription and suppression of what was to many the Church of England's most defining and best loved features: the Book of Common Prayer, the church year, and episcopacy.8 To call the suppression of the Church of England systematic would imply greater consensus and coherence among Parliamentarians, even amongst moderate presbyterians, than is likely. The attack on the Church of England managed to be both haphazard and thorough. While recent criticisms that too much coherence has been ascribed to pre-1642 Prayer Book Protestantism need to be taken seriously, it is nonetheless striking to note the specific and carefully chosen targets of the contemporary Parliamentary reformers: the Prayer Book, its calendar, and episcopal polity.9

* * *

The theological case against the Book of Common Prayer centred on more than concerns about its residual popery. To some more precise Protestants, the very idea of a set form of liturgy was unacceptable, though this was not a view held in any sense by all we might categorize as 'puritan'. Parliamentary reformers were faced with a problem not shared by the Tudor architects of the Church of England. Thomas Cranmer saw positive good in set forms of liturgy, though he saw many errors in the medieval rites that the Prayer Book replaced. One of the objectives of Common Prayer, after all, was to provide uniformity of practice throughout the country. The group of divines and others brought together as the Westminster Assembly by parliamentary

⁹ Lake and Questier, 'Introduction', xv-xvi. Cf. Marshall, Impact of the English Reformation, 232-3.

⁸ Morrill, 'Church in England', 149-54; Shaw, English Church, 1:337-57; Paul Hardacre, The Royalists During the Puritan Revolution (The Hague, 1956), 39-44; C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, eds, Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660, 3 vols (1911), 1:582, 607.

ordinance in 1643 were divided on this very notion of 'set' and 'free' prayer. To some of the moderate presbyterian view, their original intention was to reform, not suppress, the Book of Common Prayer. To more radical Protestants, however, any notion of set forms of public prayer smacked too much of incantation rather than of intercession. In the end, the result owed much to Scottish presence and influence in the Assembly.¹⁰

A Directory for the Public Worship of God was first authorized for use in 1645 and was largely what it proclaimed itself to be: not a liturgy but a set of directions for the conduct of public worship in England.¹¹ Given the abuse heaped upon the authorized liturgy for decades by the godly, the Directory's 'Preface' was surprisingly civil and even respectful of the landfalls that the Prayer Book represented on the larger journey to a properly reformed Church. 'The Preface' maintained that the Book of Common Prayer was, without a doubt, an improvement on the 'Vain, Erroneous, Superstitious and Idolatrous' worship of the medieval Church.

This occasioned many Godly and Learned men to rejoyce much in the Book of Common-Prayer at time set forth; Because the Masse, and the rest of the Latine-Service being removed, the Publique Worship was celebrated in our own Tongue.¹²

However useful in the early days of the Reformation, the Prayer Book had proved itself to be at odds with many other Reformed Churches, full of popish ceremonies, and a stumbling block to otherwise honest Christians who could not in conscience conform. The sheer familiarity of the Prayer Book turned it into something

no better than an Idol by many Ignorant and Superstituous people, who pleasing themselves in their presence at that Service, and their Lip-labour in bearing a part in it, have thereby hardened

¹⁰ Horton Davis, The Worship of the English Puritans (Glasgow, 1948), 98-114. For a detailed discussion of the formation of the Directory, see Bryan Spinks, Freedom or Order? The Eucharistic Liturgy in English Congregationalism 1645-1980 (Allison Park, PA, 1984), 14-15, 31-51 (I am grateful to Prof. Spinks for his assistance); Peter King, 'The reasons for the abolition of the Book of Common Prayer in 1645', JEH, 21 (1970), 335-7; Shaw, English Church, 1:337-49.

Morrill, 'Church in England', 152-3; Shaw, English Church, 1:353-4.

¹² A Directory for the Public Worship of God, Throughout the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland (1645), 1-2.

themselves in their ignorance and carelesnesse of saving knowledge and true piety. 13

Further, the *Directory*'s authors denied that they were motivated by a 'love [of] Novelty'. They also strongly denied that their work represented any 'intention to disparage our first Reformers' who, if they were still alive, 'The Preface' maintained, would of course be on the side of further reform. Engaging in a difficult balancing act, they acknowledged that the Edwardian Reformers were

Excellent Instruments raised by God to begin the purging and building of His House, and desire they may be had of us and posterity in everlasting Remembrance, with thankfulnesse and honour.

But that was then, this is now: providence called 'upon us for further Reformation'.14

To those more familiar with the Prayer Book, the Directory reads like a set of stage directions without the speaking parts. E.C. Ratcliff notes that the Directory needs to be seen as a compromise between moderates and radicals in the Westminster Assembly; nonetheless it was largely a victory for the latter as he notes that the Directory was 'not so much a prayer book as a rubric book'. It provided the minister with guidance on what he should say at various services but almost never provided the actual words. Significant exceptions to this general rule include the words to be used at the precise moment of baptism, which are firmly Trinitarian, and the marriage vows. Nonetheless, the use of godparents in baptism and the ring in marriage – both prohibited practices in the Directory – appears to have been widespread. 17

¹³ Ibid., 4.

¹⁴ Ibid., 6. Petitions defending the Prayer Book early in the Long Parliament made much use of the honoured status of the Edwardian bishops and martyrs who championed the Prayer Book: Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, ch. 3; eadem, 'Petitions', 113-67.

¹⁵ E.C. Ratcliff, 'Puritan alternatives to the Prayer Book: the *Directory* and Richard Baxter's *Reformed Liturgy*', in Michael Ramsey, ed., *The English Prayer Book* 1549–1662 (1963), 64; Davis, *Worship*, 127–42; Spinks, *Freedom or Order*?, 31–6.

¹⁶ Directory, 45, 62-3. Ironically it paraphrases the Prayer Book in several places. For example, in the directions for baptism the minister is reminded that those baptized are 'bound to fight against the Devill, the World and the Flesh' – a paraphrase of the Book of Common Prayer (ibid., 42, see also 49-50).

¹⁷ David Cressy, Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England (Oxford, 1997), 153, 347.

We await a major study of the English Directory, but it does seem not to have been a best-seller. There is little evidence in churchwardens' accounts for its purchase across a geographically diverse set of counties.¹⁸ There must have been considerable confusion in the localities, however, as in 1648 six clergymen in Cambridgeshire were indicted for 'refusing to administer the sacrament but according to the Directory'. 19 Simply, the Directory appears not to have met the fundamental needs of many English Christians. Sir Henry Turner, the Speaker of the House of Commons, when introducing the Uniformity Bill in 1662, spoke for many when he attacked the suppression of the Book of Common Prayer and its replacement by the Directory. He remarked that the Prayer Book was 'decried as superstitious, and in lieu thereof nothing, or worse than nothing was introduced'.20 It has been noted that in the post-Reformation Church, one of the attractive things about the Prayer Book to the laity was that it curtailed overly enthusiastic clergy from endlessly chopping and changing the church service as the fancy took them.²¹ To many Prayer Book Protestants' the Directory must have looked like the worst of all possible worlds: it prohibited many popular rituals of the reformed English rite while at the same time giving ministers far too much liberty in their verbal expression. The Prayer Book may have smacked of popery to some, but the Directory was itself intensely clerical. Apart from psalm singing, active participation in the service for the laity was virtually eliminated. Even the Lord's Prayer, if it was to be said, was to be said by the minister alone.²² The 'sacred dialogue' between clergy and people - the disparaged 'lip-labour' of ordinary men and women which marked conformist worship - was firmly rejected.²³ In the interests of freeing up the Holy Spirit, the laity were now not to be spared the full blast - in Richard Hooker's cutting phrase - of those 'voluntary dictates proceeding from' a

¹⁸ Based on my survey of extant Cheshire churchwardens' accounts; Morrill, 'The Church in England', 152-3, 156, 164-7; Linda York, '"In dens and caves": the survival of Anglicanism during the rule of the Saints, 1640-1660' (Auburn University, AL, Ph.D. thesis, 1999), 100-1; Underdown, Revel, 255-6; Cressy, Birth, 175; King, 'Reasons for Abolition', 337; Ashton, Counter-Revolution, 230-1.

¹⁹ Morrill, 'Church in England', 168.

²⁰ Journal of the House of Lords, 11:470.

²¹ Maltby, Prayer Book and People, 44-5.

²² Ratcliff, 'Puritan alternatives', 72.

²³ Parishioners took offence when clergy did not allow them to make the authorized responses in the Prayer Book. Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, 40-4.

clergyman's 'extemporal wit'.24 No wonder Sir Henry Turner saw the Directory as 'worse than nothing'.

Despite the prolonged attack over several generations by elements within the established Church, the Book of Common Prayer proved harder to sink than might have been expected from the puritan critique of it. Evidence for the liturgy's buoyancy abounds, and despite its prohibited status, some English Christians continued to use it for worship. Further, the Prayer Book provided more than a framework for the hour or two spent inside a church building for public worship or a structure for household use and the solitary prayer of individuals. Through Morning and Evening Prayer it gave shape to the day; though one suspects, apart from a few exceptions, that Cranmer's intention that the offices become the daily prayer of all the people of God rather than simply a monastic and clerical elite was never realized.²⁵ The Prayer Book helped to mark immense and universal moments in the life cycle, such as birth and death. Common Prayer also structured and shaped the year, providing days and seasons of solemnity and celebration. Although one may see it as a very impoverished cousin to the riches of the fifteenth-century world portrayed in The Stripping of the Altars, nonetheless the Prayer Book provided over thirty saints' days and other festivals of the Christian year based on the life of Christ.²⁶ Yet another popish remnant in the eyes of some, holy days were banned shortly after the book which directed their use.²⁷

Provision of Prayer Book rites was experienced in this period as, at best, episodic. The layman John Evelyn, failing in 1652 to find any services at all on Christmas Day, at other times succeeded in finding

25 See George Guiver, Company of Voices: Daily Prayer and the People of God (1988), 115-26.

²⁴ From Book V.xxv.4 in Richard Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, in The Works of Richard Hooker, cd. W. Speed Hill, 7 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1977), 2:116.

²⁶ However impoverished the Protestant liturgy was, compared to its late medieval counterpart, Eamon Duffy has admitted that 'Cranmer's sombrely magnificent prose, read week by week, entered and possessed their minds, and became the fabric of their prayer, the utterance of their most solemn and vulnerable moments': idem, The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580 (New Haven, CT, and London, 1992), 593.

²⁷ On 8 June 1647 Parliament abolished church festivals, though the Directory had already ordered their extinction: Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, 1:954, 607. A further proclamation against the observance of Christmas was issued on 24 Dec. 1652: R.S. Steele, A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns 1485-1714, 2 vols (Oxford,

churches in London itself which used the banned Prayer Book. On another Christmas Day, in 1657, Evelyn and other devotees of the Prayer Book were attacked by Parliamentary troopers. He recorded in his famous diary:

I went with my wife &c: to Lond: to celebrate Christmas day. . . . Sermon Ended, as [the minister] was giving us the holy Sacrament, The Chapell was surrounded with Souldiers: All the Communicants and Assembly surpriz'd & kept Prisoners by them. . . . [They] examined me, why contrarie to an Ordinance made that none should any longer observe the superstitious time of the Nativity (so esteem'd by them) I durst offend, & particularly be at Common prayers, which they told me was but the Masse in English.

Evelyn and his fellow communicants then proceeded to make their Christmas communions under testing circumstances.

These wretched miscreants, held their muskets against us as we came up to receive the Sacred Elements, as if they would have shot us at the Altar, but yet suffering us to finish the Office of Communion, as perhaps [it was] not in their Instructions what they should do in case they found us in that Action.²⁸

Coolness in the face of armed troopers was sometimes required of the clergy as well. According to his contemporary biographer, John Hackett (later Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield in 1661) calmly continued to read divine service even when a Parliamentary soldier of the Earl of Essex had a pistol pointed at him. Hackett and another future bishop, George Bull (consecrated to St David's in 1705), each committed to memory the funeral service and the baptismal services respectively so that they would appear to be praying extempore. The ruse worked, as this account of a funeral of a prominent puritan conducted by Hackett at the end of the Interregnum relates:

there being a great concourse of men of the same fanatical principles [as the deceased], when the company heard all delivered by him [Hackett] without book, and, with free readiness, and

²⁸ 'Christmas day no sermon anywhere, so observed it at home, the next day we went to Lewisham, where was an honest divine preach'd on 21 Matt: 9 celebrating the Incarnation, for on the day before, no Churches were permitted to meet &c; to that horrid passe were they come': John Evelyn, The Diary of John Evelyn, ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 vols (Oxford, 1955), 3:78-9, 203-4.

profound gravity . . . they were strangely surprised and affected, professing that they had never heard a more suitable exhortation, or a more edifying exercise even from the very best and most precious men of their own persuasion!

The assembled godly were aghast when Hackett revealed to them that not one syllable had been his own and how 'all was taken word for word out of the very office ordained for that purpose in the poor contemptible Book of Common Prayer'.²⁹ Examples of such Prayer Book use can be multiplied from around the country.³⁰

The attack on the festivals of the Christian year was perhaps one of the Parliamentary government's greatest misreadings of the religious sensibilities of many English people.³¹ Indeed, not only in England, but in seventeenth-century Virginia it has been recently noted how popular the reformed calendar was among the colonists – providing not only a system for dating letters but even for attending Church.³² It is worth remembering in current discussions about secularism that there was a debate in the seventeenth century as to how 'religious' a festival Christmas was as well. Richard Baxter was clear that the observance of Christmas had no place in a properly reformed Church. In a sermon preached in 1657 he remarked:

Tomorrow . . . is the day called Christmass day, and many days called Holy days do follow it. . . . There is no proof that ever I saw . . . that the Church observed any of these days, of many hundred years after Christ.³³

²⁹ Thomas Plume, An Account of the Life and Death of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Hackett, Late Lord Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, cd. Mackenzie M.C. Walcott (1865), 64-6. This incident dates from just after the Restoration but illustrates the point. John Evelyn was able to give his mother-in-law a traditional Prayer Book funeral in 1652: Cressy, Birth, 416.

³⁰ Morrill, 'Church in England', 164-8; Spurr, Restoration Church, 16-17; Ashton, Counter-Revolution, 230-4, 247, 259-61.

³¹ Ibid., 238-41.

³² Virginians modified the Prayer Book calendar as well to take into account the different rhythms of the colony's agriculture and of its premier crop, tobacco. Local events led to the development of additional days along the lines of Armada Day or the Fifth of November, such as the designation of 22 March as a day of thanksgiving for the deliverance of the colony from an Indian massacre in the 1620s. The Assembly ordered that day 'be yeerly Solemnized as [a] holydaye': Edward L. Bond, 'Religion in seventeenth-century Anglican Virginia: myth, persuasion, and the creation of an American identity' (Louisiana State University, Ph.D. thesis, 1995), 188–95. For more on colonial 'Anglicanism', see below, 244–5.

³³ Cited in Geoffrey Nuttall, Richard Baxter (1965), 54. Baxter did defend the keeping of

Yet to many contemporaries, clergy and laity alike, the government's continued observance of national 'feast days' such as Armada Day or the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot contained a bitter irony.³⁴ The laywoman, Elizabeth Newell, approved of a theological critique of this state of affairs in a series of poems she collected in honour of the banned feast of Christmas from 1655 into the 1660s. The following poem purports to be written for Christmas Day 1658:

What! the messias born, and shall a day Bethought to much expensiveness to pay To that memorial; shall an Anniversie Be kept with ostentation to rehearse A mortal princes birth-day, or defeat An Eighty Eight, or powder plots defeat[?]

And shall we venture to exterminate And starve at once the memory and date Of Christ incarnate, where in such a store Of joy to mortals lay, as never before The sun beheld, a Treasury of Bliss, The birth day of the world as well as his[?]

To Elizabeth Newell, her opponents lacked any proper understanding of Christology, or indeed, a proper understanding of the relationship of the incarnation to salvation: 'Ingrateful Man; It was for only thee/ And for thy Restitution, that he/ Did stoop to wear thy raggs . . . was content/ Thus to affirme thy nature'.³⁵ It should be noted how theologically informed are the poems she collected, not simply 'spiritual'.

Discussion of the tribulations of John Evelyn, John Hackett, Elizabeth Newell, and other members of the gentry and clergy could, however, give the impression that adherence to the Prayer Book was a preoccupation of the better sort and the religious professionals. On the contrary, it has been shown that fidelity to the

Easter Day, as the evidence was much stronger for its observation by the earliest Christians, and commended the celebration of the Lord's Supper on that day: ibid., 55.

³⁴ Evelyn, Diary, 3:47–8, 144, 235, for Gunpowder Plot celebrations in the 1650s; Ronald Hutton, The Rise and Fall of Merry England: the Ritual Year 1400–1700 (Oxford, 1994), 212, 221–2.

³⁵ New Haven, CT, Beinecke Library, Osborn MS b.49: Elizabeth Newell, 'Collection of devotional verse, c. 1655–1668', 12–13. I am grateful to Dr Elizabeth Clarke for bringing this manuscript to my attention and for other helpful discussions concerning Newell.

liturgy was also to be found further down the social ladder. In March 1648, violence erupted in Blandford in Dorset when a group of locals rescued a minister who had been arrested for using the proscribed liturgy.³⁶ Support for the Prayer Book was an element in the complex set of component parts that made up the popular uprisings by the Clubmen Associations in counties like Dorset and Wiltshire.³⁷ Newell's preservation of theologically sophisticated verse gives expression to views held more widely across the social spectrum. In 1647 indignation turned to violence in Canterbury when local people resisted the Kent Committee's attempt to suppress Christmas celebrations. The few shopkeepers who did open on Christmas Day were attacked by a mob. Significantly, the law-breaking soon took on political as well as theological overtones, as the crowd 'were soon shouting royalist slogans, "crying up King Charles, and crying down the Parliament ...", assaulting Roundheads, and consuming the free beer offered by citizens who set up holly-bushes at their doors.'38 Professor Underdown also notes evidence of continued celebration of Christmas in the 1650s in Cornwall and Devon. He maintains that where Christmas was, Royalism was likely to be present as well.³⁹ It must be remembered that the Prayer Book was 'common prayer' - a 'levelling text' - which provided some common culture across social and gender divisions. Even illiteracy did not close one off from the culture of the Prayer Book. To its hotter Protestant critics, the familiarity of the Prayer Book was its fatal flaw, turning it into an 'idol'. To the liturgy's adherents, its familiarity was its greatest aid to devotion.40

Prayer Book loyalism was to be found not only cutting across social and educational divisions but crossing an ocean as well. Thousands of miles to the west, without benefit of bishops or ecclesiastical courts, conformity to the Prayer Book appears to have been widespread in the lay-dominated Church of colonial Virginia. The mid-seventeenth-

³⁶ Underdown, Revel, 230. See also King, 'Reasons for abolition', 338-9; John Morrill and John Walter, 'Order and disorder in the English Revolution', in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds, *The English Civil War* (1997), 315 (first published 1985). For widespread support for the Prayer Book across social divisions in the pre-civil war period, see Maltby, *Prayer Book and People*, 80-1, 181-227.

⁵⁷ Underdown, Revel, 156-9, 180, 226, 255; idem, 'The chalk and the cheese: contrasts among English Clubmen', in Cust and Hughes, English Civil War (1997), 295 (first published 1979).

³⁸ Underdown, Revel, 260.

³⁹ Ibid., 256-63, 267.

⁴⁰ See above, 237-8.

century Virginian Church managed to be a broad Church, its lay leaders winking at puritan infractions as adeptly as any moderate Jacobean bishop. Indeed it would appear that the general 'external' and significantly non-Christian and 'savage' - threat provided to the colonists by America's first inhabitants made many of the theological disputes of the mother Church seem somewhat arcane. Only in the 1640s, and only after the threat from the indigenous population was reduced, did Virginian authorities turn to suppressing groups that would not use the Prayer Book, and then generally only moving against the most radical forms of nonconformity. In 1649, Norfolk county authorities banished to Maryland a group of individuals who would not conform to the Prayer Book - the same book which had been banned several years before in England. Local authorities seemed to have taken particular delight in sending such godly zealots to a colony renowned for its popery. Eventually even Cromwell had to strike a deal with the Virginians. Following a visit by his commissioners in the early 1650s, the colonists were given a general amnesty and permission to use the banned Prayer Book for another year provided the prayers for the king and royal family were omitted. In fact, it is likely they simply continued to use the old liturgy throughout the rest of the Interregnum - a speculation strengthened by the 'Cavalier' clergy who took up livings in Virginia in the 1650s.41 It is intriguing to speculate further that a Book of Common Prayer, shorn of its royalist references, provided a precedent in the late 1780s as the new Episcopal Church revised its Prayer Book to remain distinctively Anglican yet thoroughly republican.42

In his diary, Evelyn provides numerous examples of both the use of the Book of Common Prayer and widespread observance of the holy days of the Prayer Book calendar. At certain times government zeal was such that the Evelyn family, as others, had to make do with the private use of the Prayer Book at home.⁴³

⁴¹ Conformity to the Prayer Book was also enforced in Barbados during the 1650s: Larry Gragg, 'The pious and the profane: the religious life of early Barbados planters', *The Historian*, 62 (2000), 269-70, 271-2, 275-7. Between 1637 and 1660, nearly 30 ministers migrated to the island: ibid., 268, but cf. 281-2.

⁴² Bond, 'Religion in seventeenth-century Anglican Virginia', 186-222; George MacLaren Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church and the Political Conditions under which it Grew*, 2 vols, Virginia Historical Society (Richmond, VA, 1947-52), 1:122-3, 1:29-31. I am grateful to Prof. Robert Prichard for this reference and for the possible connection made to the development of Anglicanism in America in the late eighteenth century.

⁴³ Evelyn, Diary, 3:2034, see also 3:978, 144, 225.

I Jan [1653]: I set a part in preparation for the B: Sacrament, which the next day Mr. Owen administered to me & all my family in Says-Court, preaching on: 6: John 32.33. shewing the exceeding benefits of our B: Saviours taking our nature upon him.⁴⁴

The minister in question, Richard Owen, also ministered other important rites for the household, baptizing the Evelyn children and churching their mother at home according the Prayer Book.⁴⁵ Alongside such explicit acts of dissent as that Christmas Communion, there developed among Church of England loyalists an inward and quietist spirituality focused on the home and the interior religious life.⁴⁶

It is tempting to see the domestication and 'privatizing' of Prayer Book Protestantism in this period as a parallel to the experiences of recusants under Elizabeth and the early Stuarts. There were no Church of England equivalents of the Jesuits, but there were plenty of obstructive and uncooperative clergy and laity. As with Roman Catholicism, the customs of the 'Old Church' often survived in the household, sponsored by gentry who had the social standing to reduce their personal risk and the finances to support sympathetic clergy. Women too emerge as important actors in the maintenance of proscribed observances kept alive in the domestic sphere. It is surely right, as has been argued, not to see Roman Catholicism as 'hermetically sealed' in post-Reformation English society.⁴⁷ There is a sense as well that this particular comparison can be overdone.⁴⁸ Overall, there is little evidence of a widely-held view among Church of England loyalists that they saw themselves as a 'continuing' or 'true' Church in struggle with a 'false' one. The mindset appears - especially as one moves to less public (and polemical) reflections on the state of the Christian faith in England - of the Church under the influence of a misguided or even wicked leadership. For example, take Evelyn's account of attending his own parish church in 1653:

⁴⁴ Richard Owen, D.D.: ibid., 3:79.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 3:75, 76, 89, 90, 147, 195. For home churchings see Cressy, *Birth*, 225; idem, 'Purification, thanksgiving and the churching of women in post-reformation England', *Past and Present*, 141 (Nov., 1993), 140–1.

⁴⁶ Spurr, Restoration Church, 21-2.

⁴⁷ Walsham, 'Parochial roots', 651.

⁴⁸ Cf. Claire Cross, 'The Church in England 1646-1660', in G.E. Aylmer, ed., The Interregnum: the Quest for Settlement 1646-1660 (1972), 114.

30. [January, 1653] At our own *Parish Church*, a Stranger preached on I *Apoc.* 5.6 describing the greate benefits don us by our B: Lord: Note, that there was now & then, an honest orthodox man gotten into the Pulpet, and though the present *Incumbent* were somewhat Independent; yet he ordinarily preachd sound doctrine, & was a peaceable man, which was an extraordinary felicity in this age.⁴⁹

These are not the reflections of a Christian who has 'unchurched' his theological and ecclesiological antagonists. However deep in error the mainstream Protestant opponents of the Church of England might be, it was in a sense a family quarrel, whereas the Church of Rome was seen as outside the household. It is always worth remembering, of course, that most violence is precisely domestic violence. The influence of the religious upheavals of the middle of the century on Protestant ecclesiology deserves much more scholarly attention, as does a consideration of these events on England's Roman Catholic community.⁵⁰

* * *

Elizabeth Newell, John Evelyn, and John Hackett are examples of individuals who negotiated the new religious order to some extent. Others did not. Figures are not certain but between two and three thousand clergy were ejected from their livings during this period by agencies such as Parliament's Committee for Plundered Ministers. Such figures could represent an ejection rate as high as twenty-five per cent, although there was considerable regional and local variation as the initiative passed from Westminster to the localities, and the figure is mitigated by the hundreds of clergy who achieved preferment to another parish after ejection. Clergy lost their livings or other forms of preferment for a variety of offences including Royalism, the use of the Prayer Book, failure to preach, moral offences, or simply over-frequenting the ale house – or some fascinating combination of all these things.⁵¹ Although this does not diminish the ferocity with which

 $^{^{49}\,}$ The incumbent in Evelyn's description was Thomas Malory, deprived in 1661: Evelyn, Diary, 3:80–1, 81 n.5.

⁵⁰ This issue will be explored with others in a forthcoming volume of essays edited by Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby, *Religion and Society in Revolutionary England* (Manchester University Press).

⁵¹ Cross, 'Church in England', 110-14; Susan Doran and Christopher Durston, Princes, Pastors and People: the Church and Religion in England 1529-1689 (1991), 154-7; Anne Laurance, "This sad and deplorable condition": an account of the sufferings of northern

roughly a thousand clergy were ejected at the Restoration for their failure to conform to a new Act of Uniformity, it does put it in some perspective, and indeed goes part of the way not to justify such actions but to make them understandable. Professor Ivan Roots's assessment of the political settlement of 1660 is apposite for the church as well: 'there was only a smear of blood at the Restoration, but a whole streak of meanness'. 52

* * *

One of the striking things about the survival of features of the Old Church in this period is the lack of leadership provided by members of the episcopate. Outlawed practices, such as the use of the Prayer Book or the observation of holy days, survived in large part due to the courage of clergy and laity, not due to any overt leadership provided by the bishops. In fact, the bishops in England ignored repeated requests from the exiled court in the 1650s to consecrate more of their order to make up for diminishing numbers.⁵³ That said, bishops did not disappear from the scene. By 1650, only a third of English and Welsh sees were vacant, and a third of the bench at the start of the civil war survived to be restored to their privileges in the 1660s.⁵⁴

If bishops provided little public leadership to their flocks during this time of trouble, they did respond to requests for secret ordinations. A number of younger clergy (we do not know how many), often with no first-hand experience of episcopal government, sought out a second ordination from the hands of these 'redundant' bishops. It was, in truth, a sort of 'top-up' view of ordination, as these younger men appear to have continued to serve in the Interregnum Church. Such evidence again argues against the notion of the Church of England as a kind of

clergy families in the 1640s and 1650s', in Diana Wood, ed., Life and Thought in the Northern Church c. 1100-1700, SCH.S, 12 (Woodbridge, 1999), 465-7. Prof. Green estimates around 2,780 clergy were deprived: lan Green, 'The persecution of "scandalous" and "malignant" parish clergy during the English civil war', EHR, 94 (1979), 508. See also Clive Holmes, ed., The Suffolk Committees for Scandalous Ministers 1644-1646, Suffolk Records Society, 13 (1970), 10-14, 18-20. Dr Holmes notes that charges of 'popish innovation' were more common that accusations of dissent from Calvinist orthodoxy (ibid., 19). J.W.F. Hill, 'Royalist clergy of Lincolnshire', Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society, Reports and Papers, 40 (1935), 34-127.

⁵² Ivan Roots, The Great Rebellion 1642-1660 (1966), 261.

⁵³ Ronald Hutton, *The British Republic 1649-1660* (1990), 91-2, 97; Cross, 'Church in England', 110-14.

⁵⁴ Nigel Yates, Robert Hume, and Paul Hastings, *Religion and Society in Kent, 1640–1914* (Woodbridge, 1994), 5–6.

'recusant' or 'underground' Church.⁵⁵ What motivated them to seek such episcopal alternatives? Presumably it was a variety of factors, including a search for stability in a period of uncertainty and change in many areas of English life. Jeremy Taylor dryly observed of these youngsters that never had the excellency of episcopal government been so obvious now that it was lacking.⁵⁶

* * *

In what ways did individuals make sense of – construct a theology of – what was to them a catastrophic religious experience? The Warwickshire clergyman Christopher Harvey, like others, used the imagery of the Exile. His popular collection of religious verse written in imitation of George Herbert's *The Temple* was significantly entitled *The Synagogue*. For the Jews of the Babylonian captivity and later of the Diaspora, without access to the Temple, the place of sacrifice and access to God, synagogues became a way of remaining faithful in the face of the ungodly. Harvey stayed in his benefice from his institution in 1639 until his death in 1663, and in that sense qualifies as a 'survivor' not a 'sufferer'. Nonetheless, he had a strong sense of living in a state of internal exile.⁵⁷ By the third edition of *The Synagogue*, published in 1657, Harvey had become, in the words of the one admirer of his verse, a prophetic voice reminding his readers not to forget 'Israel' in the midst of ungodliness.

Sir,
While I read your lines, methinks I spie
Churches, and churchmen, and the old hierarchie:
What potent charms are these! you have the knack
To make men young again, and fetch back time.

The mid-space shrunk to nothing; manners, men, And times, and all look just as they did then;

⁵⁵ See above, 246-7.

⁵⁶ Spurr, Restoration Church, 9, 141-3 (Jeremy Taylor paraphrased ibid., 142); Cross, 'Church in England', 110-14; Hutton, British Republic, 91-2; Doran and Durston, Princes, Pastors and People, 156-7. For examples of episcopal ordinations in the 1650s, see Evelyn, Diary, 3:8-9 (in Paris), 172 and n.1. For the question of what should replace ordination by bishops in England, see Shaw, English Church, 1:243, 320-37.

⁵⁷ Judith Maltby, 'From *Temple* to *Synagogue*: "old" conformity in the 1640s-1650s and the case of Christopher Harvey', in Lake and Questier, *Conformity and Orthodoxy*, 94-103, 114-16.

Rubbish and ruin's vanisht, everywhere Order and comliness afresh appear. What cannot poets do? They change with ease The face of things, and lead us as they please. Yet here's no fiction neither: we may see The poet, prophet; his verse, historie.⁵⁸

Prayer Book Protestants attempted to make sense of their suffering Church in time-honoured ways: as identification with the sufferings of Christ, or as divine judgement for sin. In a fascinating set of correspondence with a puritan friend called Lang, the Sussex gentleman John Martin rejected the view that the degraded state of the Church of England in the 1650s was in any sense a sign of judgement on its liturgy or polity. In 1656 he wrote:

For my owne part, I cannot be of your mind, who judge our Church Forsaken of the Lord, because Afflicted by men; when I consider, that Our Saviour himselfe was a man of Sorrowes, & therefore will never be angry with His Spouse, when she is made like Him. I am rather confirm'd we are the True members of Christ our Head, because there are so many in combination, that endeavour our Extirpation.⁵⁹

Nothing, not even the 'wild extravigancies' of his own side, maintained the Sussex layman, would drive him 'out of the Good Old Way'.60 Biblical paradigms of Hebrew exile or identification with the redemptive sufferings of Christ helped some to make sense of the collapse of their religious tradition.

Inevitably in the Christian psyche, however, some saw the miseries of the 1640s and 1650s as divine punishment. As an earlier generation interpreted the persecutions of Mary I as divine disapproval of the half-heartedness of the Edwardian reformation, so too the destruction of the Church of England by Parliament was seen by subsequent Protestants also as an expression of divine wrath for past errors and

⁵⁸ Christopher Harvey, The Complete Poems of Christopher Harvey, ed. A.B. Grosart (The Fuller Worthies' Library, privately printed, 1874), 88-9. The poem was reportedly written in 1654(/5?). See Maltby, 'Temple to Synagogue', 114-15, 120.

⁵⁹ Washington DC, Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.454: 'The Letterbook of John Martin', 18. I am grateful to Mr David Cleggett, the Archivist of Leeds Castle Foundation, and Miss Lactitia Yeandle, the Archivist of the Folger Shakespeare Library, for their assistance with this manuscript.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

sins.61 The religious drivers were the same, one might reflect, but the conclusions were strikingly different. The Norfolk gentleman Clement Spelman (1598-1679) raised these very issues in a draft letter written at the Restoration to the new Bishop of Durham, John Cosin. Spelman related to Cosin that while he was part of the Royalist garrison at Oxford he caused a tract by his father Sir Henry Spelman (1564?-1641) defending tithes to be re-published in 1646 with an extensive introduction by himself.62 Charles I asked to see Clement, having read his father's tract, and 'afterwards said when god pleased to restore him, hee would restore his impropriacions to the church'. 'A resolution', reflected Spelman, 'befitting so pyous a prince.'63 But monarchical devotion would not be the over-arching theme of the layman's letter to the new bishop. Spelman embarked on a fascinating theological and historical analysis of England's and the Church of England's ills over the past two decades. Cataloguing the long dynastic troubles of the Tudors and Stuarts, he placed the woes firmly as a result of the seizure of Church property by the crown. He concluded that this seizure of Church property, not the destruction of the monastic life - there is no hint of remorse for the latter - was a great sin:

for gods punishment never exceed[s] the offence, and since the punishment was nationall I must believe the sinne soe too, and I know noe nationall sinne in England but that of Sacrilidge committed as a Law by act of parliament, whereto everyone is Cosentinge eyther actually by himselfe or implicitively by his Representative in parliament.⁶⁴

⁶¹ See the oration of John Hales to Elizabeth I in 1559 in John Foxe, Acts and Monuments (1576), 2005-7. Also Catherine Davis, "Poor persecuted little flock": Edwardian protestant concepts of the church', in Peter Lake and Maria Dowling, eds, Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth-Century England (1987), 78, 81, 94-5. I am grateful to Dr Tom Freeman for these references. For the attempts by English radicals to make sense of their defeat in 1660, see Christopher Hill, The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries (New York, 1084).

⁶² This is likely to be Henry Spelman's *De non tenerandis ecclesis* (1st edn 1613). Clement's letter is almost certainly to John Cosin and dated c.1660-2: Durham, Durham University Archives [hereafter DUA], Cosin LB 1b, no. 94. See also 'Clement Spelman' and 'Sir Henry Spelman' in *New DNB* (on-line, 1995).

⁶³ DUA, Cosin LB 1b, no. 94.

⁶⁴ Ibid. Clement was very much his father's spiritual and intellectual heir. Sir Henry's extensive treatment of his theme in *The History and Fate of Sacrilege* was not published until 1698. He provided a gazetteer of former monastic lands in Norfolk and catalogued a variety of terrible fates which befell the families that turned church property to secular

That the destruction of the Church of England, its liturgy and festivals, and the years of civil war and unrest were God's wake-up call to the new regime, Spelman was in no doubt:

And when wee observe gods method in our punishment, wee have reason to believe that, that Sacriledge drue on us this punishment, for the same order the King & Kingdome tooke to Robb god and the Church, the same methode god observes to punish the King and Nation.

Constructing an eerie symmetry, Spelman noted that Henry VIII used Parliament, sitting in St Stephen's Chapel, to rob the Church one November. So God, to punish both the king and nation, used Parliament again sitting in St Stephen's Chapel, again in November, to pass an Act to dissolve the monarchy: an eye for an eye, or a dissolution for a dissolution.

The Kinge makes use of a Crumwell to Dissolve the Monastryes, and god of a Crumwell borne in a dissolved Monastrye to punish the Kinge, thus our punishment sprang from our Sinnes.

In the mind of Spelman this relentless divine punishment for sacrilege pursued Charles I to his last sacramental act:

King Henry 8 had taken all the Challices from the Alters of the Dissolved Monasterys and the parliament and Crumwell seise all the Kings plate soe that the day before that his Majestie dyed hee was necesitated to send to the Taverne at Charing-Cross to borrow a Cup wherein to receive his last Communion at St James a disolved hospitall his prison, whence the next daye his Majestie goes to Whitehall the place of his murder first a Religious house one of the 40ty dissolved, and given to Cardinall Wosley by him built for the ArchBp of Yorke, but againe torne from the Church by King Henry 8: and made his Court.

Spelman suggested that funds could be annexed to impoverished dioceses like Chester and Peterborough (significantly both cathedral churches are former monastic houses) to help 'expiate a Continued Sacrildge'. The devout layman urged the new bishop to encourage Charles II to 'religously pay what his father piously promised to the

uses: ibid., 243-82; Alexandra Walsham, Providence in Early Modern England (Oxford, 1999), 109-10.

Church' making Cosin a 'Nathan to our David'. 65 Sadly among Cosin's papers in Durham there is no reply.

* * *

This raises another emerging theme which can only be touched on here: the real ambivalence towards the monarchy and the Supreme Governorship of the Church of England. We are familiar with the 'cult' of Charles I, a king far more impressive and useful in his death to co-religionists than he ever was in life. John Spurr has written powerfully of the psychological effect on the nation, shared by Laudian and puritan and those in between, of the execution of the king.

To many this was not simply the nadir of a cause, but the beginning of the end: God had removed the English Josiah, and the ruin of Judah herself could only be a matter of time.... The anniversary of the regicide and the expiation of the nation's guilt now became central motifs in the prayers of intercession used by the 'mourners in Sion'.66

Ironically, given the suppression of the Church calendar and the Prayer Book by Parliament, Charles's death created a new 'holy day' and a market for new liturgies. In the royal chapel in Paris, John Cosin adapted the daily offices of the Book of Common Prayer to provide a service to be used every Tuesday - the day of Charles's execution. Morning and Evening Prayer began with the verse Enter not into judgement with thy servants O Lord, for no flesh is righteous in thy sight' and instead of the more upbeat Venite, Psalm 121 ('I will lift up mine eyes') was to be used. The portion of the psalms appointed to be read antiphonally reveals a sense of desolation. The appointed readings from Scripture also matched the mood: for Morning Prayer, Genesis 28.10-22 (God's promise to Jacob in a dream to be with him) and Luke 21.1-21 (foretelling by Christ of the sufferings of his followers and the destruction of Jerusalem); and for Evening Prayer, II Chronicles 20.1-21 (the prophet Jahaziel tells the people of Judah that God is with them in the face of a much larger enemy) and I Peter 2 (identification with Christ as the rejected stone and a call to accept the proper political and social order). The psalm appointed was, appropriately, De profundis,

⁶⁵ DUA, Cosin LB 1b, no. 94. This remarkable description of Charles's last hours is not mentioned in the classic account by C.V. Wedgewood, *The Trial of Charles I* (1964), 177-82.
66 Spurr, Restoration Church, 20-1; Maltby, 'Temple to Synagogue', 115.

Psalm 130, 'Out of the deep'. The responses were re-drafted and emphasised the need for divine protection in the present and divine intervention to secure the restoration of Charles II in the future. Additional material for Holy Communion reflected these concerns as well.⁶⁷

None the less there is a striking undercurrent of unease and discontent among Church of England loyalists about Charles himself and more significantly, about basing the claims of authenticity for the established Church on arguments around the Supreme Governorship. In the 1647 edition of *The Synagogue*, Harvey included a poem extolling every Church officer of the now defunct Church of England from the parish sexton to bishop. In Harvey's construction, the top of the ecclesiastical totem-pole was the bishop; there is no poem called 'The Supreme Governor'. In fact, Harvey contrasted unfavourably the precious metals of the Communion plate to the gold of a royal crown:

Never was gold or silver gracèd thus Before: To bring this Body and this Blood to us Is more Then to crown kings.

As I have commented elsewhere, it is very tempting indeed to see this as a veiled, though rather thinly veiled, criticism of Charles's Supreme Governorship. Harvey continues:

⁶⁷ DUA, Cosin Library B.IV.4: A Forme of Prayer, used in the King's Chapel upon Tuesdayes, in these Times of Trouble and Distresse (?Paris, 1649).

Of service truly Perform'd and duly, Is to bespeak eternity of bliss.⁶⁸

Even Cosin's customized Prayer Book appointed as the first collect at Morning Prayer one for the Church, not for the sovereign:

Lord, we beseech thee, let thy continual pity cleanse and defend thy Church: and because it cannot continue in safety without thy succour, preserve it evermore by thy help and goodness, through Jesus Christ our Lord.⁶⁹

This became, in fact, the collect for Trinity 16 in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. The collect also appeared in the pre-civil war Prayer Books, but in 1662 the word 'Church', as in this post-regicide rite, replaced the more 'godly' term 'congregation'. For many Church of England loyalists the Stuarts were at best a mixed blessing.

* * *

The period of England's brief (to date) experiment with religious localism and republicanism saw the suppression of the Book of Common Prayer, episcopal polity and (perhaps most unpopular of all) the reformed ritual year. These experiences of suppression helped to form an 'Anglican' identity, though even in this period 'Anglican' is a problematic word to use with any degree of historical and scholarly integrity. We must always remember that it was little used by contemporaries. In many ways, 'episcopalian' is a better term, though ironically the fact that it is so is due more to lay and clerical faithfulness than to episcopal leadership. What we observe in the 1640s and 1650s is the hardening of certain religious traditions within the larger pre-civil war Church of England and their emergence as the Church of England. The formation of this religious identity was greatly aided by the retrospective spin doctors of the Restoration Church of England; the biographer Izaak Walton being both the most

⁶⁸ Harvey, Poems, 26-7; Maltby, 'Temple to Synagogue', 115.

⁶⁹ DUA, Cosin Library, B.IV.4.

⁷⁰ F.E. Brightman, The English Rite: Being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, 2 vols (1921), 2:516–17; Marion J. Hatchett, Commentary on the American Prayer Book (San Francisco, 1995), 190.

⁷¹ For a discussion of earlier ambivalence towards the royal supremacy, see Davis, 'Edwardian protestant concepts', 78-9.

notable and engaging of them. Walton, not Richard Hooker, in many ways deserves the title of the inventor of Anglicanism.⁷² As Professor John Morrill has remarked: 'religious commitment is best observed in periods of persecution'.⁷³ Before the civil war, religious identities invested in the liturgy, the calendar, and episcopacy formed a flexible and considerable strand within the larger national Church. In Cromwell's England it was the suppression of these same key components of a religious tradition, in particular the attempt to suppress the Book of Common Prayer, rather than the abolition of the monarchy, that helped paradoxically to create a self-conscious 'Anglicanism'.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

⁷² See Jessica Martin's excellent study, Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemoration and the Rise of Biography (Oxford, 2001); Peter Lake, Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterian and Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker (1988), 225–30; Maltby, Prayer Book and People, 235–7.

⁷³ Morrill, 'Church in England', 150.